

1 LARSON ZIRZOW KAPLAN & COTTNER  
 2 ZACHARIAH LARSON, ESQ.  
 3 Nevada Bar No. 7787  
 4 E-mail: zlarson@lzkclaw.com  
 5 MATTHEW C. ZIRZOW, ESQ.  
 6 Nevada Bar No. 7222  
 7 E-mail: mzirzow@lzkclaw.com  
 8 850 E. Bonneville Ave.  
 9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 10 Tel: (702) 382-1170  
 11 Fax: (702) 382-1169

12 Attorneys for Debtors

13 MCDONALD HOPKINS LLC  
 14 SCOTT N. OPINCAR (Ohio Bar # 0064027)  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
 15 E-mail: sopincar@mcdonaldhopkins.com  
 16 MICHAEL J. KACZKA (Ohio Bar # 0076548)  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
 17 Email: mkaczka@mcdonaldhopkins.com  
 18 600 Superior Avenue, East, Suite 2100  
 19 Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2653  
 20 Tel: (216) 348-5400  
 21 Fax: (216) 348-5474

22 Attorneys for Debtors

23 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

24 In re:  
 25 GENERATION NEXT FRANCHISE  
 26 BRANDS, INC.,  
 Affects this Debtor.

27 Case No. 19-17921-mkn  
 28 Chapter 11 (Lead Case)  
 29 (Jointly Administered)

30 In re:  
 31 REIS & IRVY'S INC.,  
 Affects this Debtor.

32 Case No. 19-17922-mkn  
 33 Chapter 11

34 In re:  
 35 PRINT MATES, INC.,  
 Affects this Debtor.

36 Case No. 19-17923-mkn  
 37 Chapter 11

38 In re:  
 39 19 DEGREES, INC.,  
 Affects this Debtor.

40 Case No. 19-17924-mkn  
 41 Chapter 11

42 Date: January 24, 2020  
 43 Time: 10:30 a.m.

44 **DEBTORS' MOTION TO CONVERT CHAPTER 11**  
**CASES TO CHAPTER 7 PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. § 1112(a)**

45 Generation Next Franchise Brands, Inc., a Nevada corporation ("Generation Next"), Reis  
 46 & Irvy's Inc., a Nevada corporation ("R&I"), Print Mates, Inc., a Nevada corporation ("Print  
 47 Mates") and 19 Degrees Inc., a Nevada corporation ("19 Degrees" and collectively with  
 48 Generation Next, R&I, and Print Mates, the "Debtors") in the above-referenced cases (the  
 49 "Chapter 11 Cases"), submit their motion (the "Motion") to convert their chapter 11  
 50 reorganization cases voluntarily to chapter 7 liquidation cases pursuant to section 1112(a) of title

11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”). This Motion is made and based on the  
 2 following points and authorities, the *Declaration of Ryan Polk* filed in support of the Motion, the  
 3 *Omnibus Declaration of Ryan Polk in Support of Chapter 11 Petitions and First Day Motions*  
 4 (the “Omnibus Declaration”) [ECF No. 27], the papers and pleadings on file with the Court in  
 5 these Chapter 11 Cases, judicial notice of which is requested, and any oral testimony or  
 6 argument presented to the Court at a hearing on the Motion.

## 7           **I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8           1.       On December 15, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), the Debtors filed their voluntary  
 9 petitions for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, thereby commencing their  
 10 respective Chapter 11 Cases. The Debtors are authorized to operate their businesses as debtors  
 11 in possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtors’  
 12 Chapter 11 Cases are being jointly administered, and an Official Committee of Unsecured  
 13 Creditors (the “Committee”) has been appointed [ECF No. 78] and sought to retain counsel.

14           2.       The Court has subject matter jurisdiction to consider and determine this matter  
 15 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
 16 157(b). Pursuant to Local Rule 9014.2, the Debtors consent to the entry of final orders and  
 17 judgments by the bankruptcy judge. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

## 18           **II. BACKGROUND**

### 19           A.       Overview of the Debtors’ Businesses.

20           3.       The Debtors are a leading developer of unattended retail solutions and vending  
 21 machines. In 2016, Generation Next’s vending machine business acquired the intellectual  
 22 property assets of Robofusion, Inc. (“RFI”), which included robotic-kiosk vending technology,  
 23 including frozen yogurt and ice cream vending robots. Prior to the acquisition, Generation Next  
 24 strategically acquired patents protecting the development of a frozen confectionary robot, and the  
 25 acquisition allowed Generation Next to move into development mode. Since the acquisition,  
 26 Generation Next, through its flagship brand R&I, has developed a state-of-the-art robotic soft  
 27 serving vending robot that serves customized frozen yogurt treats using a fully automated,

1 patented system. This free-standing system can be placed in a mall, airport, hospital, tourist  
2 attraction, casino, resort, college campus, or other high foot-traffic area. The robots allow  
3 consumers to use the kiosk to select and customize a frozen yogurt treat with toppings without  
4 the need for on-site staff. A kiosk is a free-standing, 15 square foot machine that is self-cleaning  
5 and sanitizing, and can be serve up to 200 cups of frozen yogurt before a refill. Unlike other  
6 frozen yogurt systems, there is a lower cost of entry than traditional frozen yogurt systems, can  
7 be operated full or part time, there is no staff required, and the systems are installed in locations  
8 where there is already a captive audience. The proprietary software platform integrated into the  
9 vending robots allows the company to monitor sales from each of the machines remotely,  
10 including customer trends and purchasing behavior.

11       4. R&I sold franchise rights for the vending robots. In 2018, the first franchisees  
12 began operating their robots in the field, and 170 units were installed during the first half of  
13 fiscal year 2018. Franchise owners typically set the retail price and negotiate rent terms with  
14 locations hosting R&I's kiosks.

15       5. On March 28, 2019, the company entered into an Asset Purchase Agreement to  
16 purchase the Print Mates business, including intellectual property. Print Mates kiosks offer  
17 instant high-resolution printing of photographs from touchscreen kiosks. Print Mates kiosks are  
18 operated with a proprietary software interface that takes advantage of the kiosk's large touch-  
19 screen, allowing customers to swipe and scroll through various menus as well as edit and crop  
20 their images before printing. The company intended to own and operate the kiosks, collecting  
21 100% of the revenues generated, and to sell kiosks and license software to business owners.

22       6. 19 Degrees is the managing member of 19 Degrees Corporate Service, LLC, a  
23 robot investment fund (the "Fund") that was to accredited investors (*i.e.* franchisees and other  
24 direct purchase investors) to contribute kiosks to the Fund and receive quarterly distributions of  
25 net proceeds from operating the robots. 19 Degrees provides services pursuant to a Management  
26 Services Agreement, and manages the Fund account. 19 Degrees was to earn a management fee  
27 of 1.5% from 19 Degrees Corporate Services. Although 19 Degrees Corporate Services is

1 managed by 19 Degrees, a variety of independent parties also own its membership units.

2 **B. Problems with the Kiosks.**

3       7. The company's aggressive growth, together with some external manufacturing  
4 and delivery issues, led to a large delay in delivery of kiosks. In September 2017, Generation  
5 Next entered into a Design Services Agreement with Flextronics Industrial, Ltd., n/k/a Flex, Ltd.  
6 ("Flex"), to provide certain design and engineering services for its frozen yogurt kiosks, as well  
7 as a Manufacturing Services Agreement with Flex to perform various manufacturing services of  
8 those products. Flex repeatedly missed delivery commitments throughout 2018, among other  
9 significant delays and issues. These delays put Generation Next at least 18 months behind  
10 schedule delivering kiosks and caused substantial cash withdrawals, leading to research and  
11 development overruns at Flex, significant repair expenses from a third-party engineering firm,  
12 prepaid inventory in excess of production capacity, ongoing operating expenses, and certain  
13 refunds to franchisees who did not want to wait for the delay in the delivery of their units.

14       8. In January 2018, the company entered into a Manufacturing Agreement with The  
15 Vollrath Company, LLC ("Stoelting") of Kiel, Wisconsin, through which Stoelting was to  
16 provide premium soft serve technology and a national service to R&I's branded frozen yogurt  
17 robots. In May 2019, this relationship expanded such that Stoelting also included manufacturing  
18 and kiosk engineering services for an interim production period. During Stoelting's interim  
19 production period, the company will be transferring assembly know-how to either back to Flex  
20 or a new partner such as Foxconn or Jabil.

21       9. In January 2019, Generation Next and Flex entered into a Transition and Interim  
22 Production Agreement with Flex, which noted that a dispute had arisen between the production  
23 and development of the kiosks, and that the parties disagreed regarding their respective  
24 obligations under their agreements. Additionally, this agreement noted that Flex had recently  
25 halted production and shipment of kiosks, components, replacement parts and kits designed to  
26 retrofit previously delivered kiosks with upgrades. This agreement further provided that  
27 Generation Next would transition to a new manufacturer and terminate their relationship, but in

1 an effort to mitigate potential losses, they entered into an agreement to govern the manufacture  
2 and delivery of kiosks and related retrofit kits and materials between then and August 31, 2019.

3       10. Currently, the Debtors have approximately 15 finished kiosks with Pitney Bowes  
4 near the installation site, 21 kiosks at Flex, 5 kiosks at Service 1, and 46 kiosks that have been  
5 removed from locations and are being staged for inspection and repair, and certain parts that will  
6 be used in the assembly of finished kiosks. The company was also working on a refurbishment  
7 process to repair issues with kiosks. A significant portion of the kiosk components can be used  
8 for a variety of applications, and are not unique to the company's robot, increasing the potential  
9 to recover on these assets. As part of the RFI acquisition, the Company also acquired a patent  
10 portfolio relating to the robotic system, including utility and design patents relating to the  
11 dispensing stations and a method for assembly of frozen confectionary products.

12       C. **Recent Operating Performance.**

13       11. For the year ending June 30, 2019, Generation Next recognized revenue on 426  
14 kiosks; this equates to revenues of approximately \$16.3 million from the sale of vending robots  
15 and \$1.4 million in franchise fees, respectively. In order to assist franchisees with support and  
16 pay for certain administrative costs (such as merchant fees, software fees, etc.), R&I charges a  
17 monthly royalty fee of 12% of gross receipts. The company aggregates and controls the bank  
18 account that receives the credit card payments by kiosk customers, and this account is settled  
19 each month with the franchise owners. The royalties due from each franchisee are netted against  
20 the credit card receipts due to each franchise owner. The amount is deducted from the  
21 remittance checks R&I cuts to franchisees every month from sales at the kiosks. R&I does not  
22 charge a marketing fund fee or other fee. For the year ending June 30, 2019, the company  
23 recognized approximately \$315,000 in franchise royalty revenue. The company also worked to  
24 negotiate certain rebates from consumable suppliers for yogurt sold at the kiosks, which  
25 Generation Next expects will turn into further revenue.

26       12. The company also received deposits from the sale of franchises. Typically, the  
27 company received a deposit of 40% to 60% of the contract value, and the remainder of the

1 contract value of each machine was typically received within 7 days before or after delivery.  
 2 The company had used certain of those deposits to fund operating and debt service, purchase and  
 3 deliver 430 kiosks, build inventory, and refund certain franchise deposits.

4       13. As of June 30, 2019, the company's total revenues were \$18.3 million. For the  
 5 year ended June 30, 2019, the company had a net loss totaling approximately \$19 million with  
 6 negative cash flows from operations totaling approximately \$13.5 million. Through June 30,  
 7 2019 the company's production and installation of kiosks have been slower than anticipated, due  
 8 to delays caused by engineering and manufacturing deficiencies, which have since been  
 9 corrected. The impacts of production delays were decreased revenue recognition and less  
 10 accounts receivable collections. Also, the company used cash on hand to retire liabilities  
 11 associated with the franchise rescissions, for research, development and engineering  
 12 expenditures related to its robotic soft serve vending kiosks, for warranty expenses and for the  
 13 purchase of robot inventory. The combined result of these events was a substantial decrease in  
 14 the company's cash balances and an increase in its outstanding liabilities.

15       14. As of the Petition Date, the company was also a defendant in at least thirteen (13)  
 16 active lawsuits in state and federal court throughout the country brought by disappointed  
 17 franchisees, among other matters, making a variety of claims, and at least that many additional  
 18 franchisees were threatening potential litigation. The company simply lacks the resources to  
 19 defend all of these active and potential litigations, and satisfy all the concerns raised in them, and  
 20 these matters were a significant driving force behind the need to seek bankruptcy relief.

21       **D. The Company's Attempt to Raise Additional Funding Pre-Petition.**

22       15. In early September 2019, the company hired Stout Risius Ross Advisors, LLC  
 23 ("Stout") as an investment banker to assist in company's raise of bridge financing with the  
 24 following goals: fund kiosk production sufficient to reasonably meet franchise backlog, restart  
 25 production with Stoelting, and fund a permanent transition to Foxconn or Jabil. The company  
 26 was also in the process of developing a larger equity raise for the spring of 2020 to complete the  
 27 company's long term-goals. These goals included, but were not limited to, transitioning to a

1 hybrid model (including both franchise and corporately owned and operated units), launching  
 2 certain customer loyalty and analytics programs, targeting global growth of R&I, and developing  
 3 an additional unattended retail platform.

4       16. Stout developed certain marketing materials for the bridge financing process,  
 5 including a teaser and a confidential information memorandum (the “CIM”). Stout also worked  
 6 to develop a targeted investor list and contacted parties that would be interested in providing  
 7 bridge financing only or bridge financing only with a “follow on” equity investment. Upon  
 8 information and belief, Stout contacted 81 parties about the opportunity, and 33 parties received  
 9 the teaser. While 21 parties received the CIM and signed a non-disclosure agreement, 18 parties  
 10 passed upon review and receipt of the CIM (the remaining three were unresponsive), and Stout  
 11 did not receive any term sheets as a result of the process.

12       E. **The Debtors’ Prepetition Indebtedness.**

13       17. **Socially Responsible.** On October 27, 2015, Generation Next, then known as  
 14 Fresh Healthy, as borrower entered into a loan arrangement (the “SR Loan”) with Socially  
 15 Responsible Brands, Inc. (“Socially Responsible”), as lender. Nicholas Yates, the former CEO  
 16 and Chairman of the company, is the 20% owner of Socially Responsible. The SR Loan was set  
 17 forth in two Secured Promissory Notes (the “SR Notes”), evidencing indebtedness in the original  
 18 principal amount of \$250,000 each, and \$500,000 in the aggregate, and have terms of eighteen  
 19 months and one year, respectively. The SR Loan was secured by a Security Agreement (the “SR  
 20 Security Agreement”) granting a security interest in all of Generation Next’s assets. The SR  
 21 Loan was also accompanied by a Subordination Agreement (the “SR Subordination Agreement”)  
 22 granting Socially Responsible priority over certain other existing indebtedness. On November  
 23 12, 2015, Socially Responsible filed a financing statement indicating that the debtor’s names was  
 24 Fresh Healthy, however, the company is not aware of any amendment thereto having ever been  
 25 filed by Socially Responsible after Fresh Healthy changed its name to Generation Next in or  
 26 about March 2016.

27       18. On January 20, 2017, Socially Responsible agreed to extend the maturity date on

1 their note until December 31, 2017. In connection with the loan extension, the holder may  
 2 convert their SR Notes into shares of the company's stock at \$.16 per share. Furthermore, on  
 3 September 18, 2017, the SR Notes were amended whereby the interest rate was modified to a  
 4 rate of 20% per annum effective October 1, 2016 and the maturity date was further extended  
 5 until December 31, 2019 (collectively, the "SR Notes Amendments").

6       19.     **Presto Yogurt.** In February 2019, R&I entered into a Rescission Agreement (the  
 7     "Presto Rescission Agreement") with Presto Yogurt Vending, LLC ("Presto Yogurt"), which  
 8     provided that R&I would pay the sum of \$70,000 to Presto Yogurt. On February 14, 2019, R&I  
 9     entered into a Security Agreement with Presto Yogurt (the "Presto Security Agreement"), which  
 10    granted Presto Yogurt a security interest in two (2) specific robotic soft-serve vending kiosks  
 11    (identified by serial number) (the "Presto Collateral").

12       20.     **Brett Hall.** Dated as of October 22, 2019, Generation Next and R&I, as  
 13    borrowers, and Brett Hall ("Hall"), as lender, entered into a Business Loan and Security  
 14    Agreement (the "Hall Loan Agreement") and related Secured Promissory Note (the "Hall  
 15    Note"). Hall is an individual residing in Carlsbad, California. The Hall Note was in the original  
 16    principal amount of \$25,000.00 and executed by Generation Next, as borrower. The Hall Loan  
 17    Agreement granted Hall a security interest in and to substantially all of the applicable debtors'  
 18    assets, but subordinate to the interests of GLL (as hereinafter defined). On December 6, 2019,  
 19    Hall filed a UCC-1 financing statement to perfect his security interest in and to any collateral.

20       21.     **CK Green Partners.** Dated as of November 12, 2019, Generation Next and  
 21    R&I, as borrowers, and CK Green Partners, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company ("CK  
 22    Green"), as lender, entered into a Business Loan and Security Agreement (the "CK Green Loan  
 23    Agreement") and related Secured Promissory Note (the "CK Green Note"). The CK Note was in  
 24    the original principal amount of \$103,725.00 and executed by Generation Next, as borrower.  
 25    The CK Green Loan Agreement provided that the CK Green Note would bear interest at the rate  
 26    of 15% per annum, no monthly payments were required, and was due in full in 180 days. The  
 27    CK Green Loan Agreement granted CK Green a security interest in and to substantially all of the

1 Debtor's assets, but subordinate to the interests of GLL (discussed below). On November 27,  
 2 2019, CK Green filed a UCC-1 financing statement to perfect its security interest in and to any  
 3 collateral.

4       22.     **Ken Cascarella.** Dated as of November 12, 2019, Generation Next and R&I, as  
 5 borrowers, and Kenneth D. Cascarella ("Cascarella"), as lender, entered into a Business Loan  
 6 and Security Agreement (the "Cascarella Loan Agreement") and related Secured Promissory  
 7 Note (the "Cascarella Note"). The Cascarella Note was in the original principal amount of  
 8 \$100,000.00 and executed by Generation Next, as borrower. The Cascarella Loan Agreement  
 9 provided that the Cascarella Note would bear interest at the rate of 15% per annum, no monthly  
 10 payments were required, and was due in full in 180 days. The Cascarella Loan Agreement  
 11 granted Cascarella a security interest in and to substantially all of the Debtor's assets, but  
 12 subordinate to the interests of GLL (as hereinafter defined). On December 6, 2019, Cascarella  
 13 filed a UCC-1 financing statement to perfect its security interest in and to any collateral.

14       23.     **GLL Prepetition Loans.** On or about November 15, 2019, the Debtors, as  
 15 borrowers, entered into a loan arrangement with GLL as lender. GLL's loan was evidenced by a  
 16 Business Loan and Security Agreement (the "GLL Loan Agreement") that granted GLL a  
 17 security interest in substantially all of Debtors' assets.

18       24.     The GLL Loan Agreement included a Promissory Note in the amount of \$300,000  
 19 (the "First GLL Note") executed by Generation Next, as borrower, that was due in full in 90  
 20 days, plus interest payable of 20% per annum, and with interest payments payable on the last day  
 21 of each calendar month, in arrears, commencing on the last day of the first full calendar month,  
 22 in kind by an automatic increase to the principal amount of the Note by the amount of such  
 23 interest due. The GLL Loan Agreement granted GLL a security interest in all of Generation  
 24 Next's assets, wherever located, whenever acquired and successions, accession, attachments  
 25 thereto and proceeds thereof. On November 19, 2019, GLL perfected its security interest in all  
 26 of its collateral by filing a UCC-1 financing statements with the Nevada Secretary of State.

27       25.     On or about December 3, 2019, the Debtors, as borrowers, and GLL, as lender,

1 entered into an additional Secured Promissory Note (the “Second GLL Note”) in the principal  
 2 amount of \$25,000. The additional loan per the Second GLL Note was secured pursuant to the  
 3 existing GLL Security Agreement.

4       26. On December 5, 2019, the Debtors entered into an Intellectual Property Security  
 5 Agreement with GLL, which confirmed that GLL had been granted a security interest in all of  
 6 the Debtors’ intellectual property assets under the original loan documents.

7       27. Prior to the Petition Date, the GLL Loan is in senior secured position in and to all  
 8 of the Debtors’ property pursuant to various subordination agreements and/or as a matter of law  
 9 given the timing of the filing of their financing statement prior to other secured loans to the  
 10 Debtors’ businesses.

11       28. After tapping what resources it could for potential financing pre-petition, the  
 12 Debtors lacked access to further capital without a bankruptcy filing needed to continue operating,  
 13 and were in imminent danger of failing and being forced to immediately cease all operations. As  
 14 a result, the Debtors commenced their Chapter 11 Cases to explore strategic alternatives to  
 15 maximize the value of their estates and the recoveries of their stakeholders, including a sale of all  
 16 or substantially all of their assets as a going concern.

17       F. **The Debtors’ DIP Financing and Potential Sale.**

18       29. On the Petition Date, the Debtors filed their *Motion for Interim and Final Orders*:  
 19 *(I) Authorizing the Debtors to Obtain Senior Secured, Superpriority Postpetition Financing; (II)*  
*Granting Liens and Superpriority Claims; (III) Approving Loan Documents Relating to the*  
*Foregoing; (IV) Modifying the Automatic Stay; (V) Scheduling Final Hearing; and (V) Granting*  
*Other Related Relief* (the “DIP Financing Motion”) [ECF Nos. 22 and 39], and sought  
 23 emergency approval thereof on an interim basis, pending a final hearing. The DIP Financing  
 24 Motion sought postpetition financing from GLL, as lender, on a first-priority secured,  
 25 superpriority basis, pursuant to the terms of the Revolving Line of Credit Secured Promissory  
 26 Note and the Secured Loan and Security Agreement (the “DIP Loan Agreement”), of additional  
 27 indebtedness up to \$2,535,000.00, with up to \$500,000.00 of that being drawn on an emergency

1 interim basis pending a final hearing. The DIP Loan Agreement was secured in substantially all  
 2 of the Debtors' assets, except for Avoidance Actions.

3       30. Among other matters, the DIP Loan Agreement impose the following Milestone  
 4 Requirements: (i) the Debtors were to file a motion to approve bidding and sale procedures  
 5 (including break-up fee, qualified bidder requirements, bid, sale hearing, auction and closing  
 6 deadlines, and bidding rules), all in the form acceptable to GLL, no later than 21 days after the  
 7 Petition Date (by January 6, 2020)<sup>1</sup>; (ii) the Debtors shall obtain approval of the Bid Procedures  
 8 Motion no later than 55 days after the Petition Date (by Saturday, February 8, 2020); (iii) the  
 9 Borrowers shall conduct an auction no later than 90 days after the Petition Date (by Saturday,  
 10 March 14, 2020); (iv) the Debtors shall obtain final approval of any 363 Sale transaction no later  
 11 than 100 days after the Petition Date (by Tuesday, March 24, 2020). The Debtors' failure to  
 12 comply with the Milestone Requirements is an event of default under the DIP Loan Agreement.  
 13 See DIP Loan Agreement, p. 21, § 8.1(g).

14       31. On December 26, 2019, the Court entered an *Interim Order* (the “Interim DIP  
 15 Financing Order”) [ECF No. 62] approving the DIP Financing Motion, and pending a final  
 16 hearing scheduled on January 16, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.<sup>2</sup> On an interim basis, the definition of  
 17 Collateral subject to GLL’s liens was subject to a Carve-Out and specifically excluded all  
 18 Avoidance Actions under chapter 5 of the Bankruptcy Code. See id. p. 17, ¶ 9(c), and DIP Loan  
 19 Agreement, p. 11, ¶ 5.16(d). As a result, potential Avoidance Actions remain unencumbered  
 20 property that may be available to provide a return to creditors.

21       32. A potential credit bid from GLL was the only potential offer that had been  
 22 received for the Debtors’ assets. Therefore, the Debtors’ commenced intense good-faith

23  
 24 <sup>1</sup> The date that is 21 days after the Petition Date technically fell on Saturday, January 4, 2020, and thus GLL agreed  
 that the deadline was actually the following business day, Monday, January 6, 2020.

25 <sup>2</sup> The DIP Loan Agreement technically required that a final order approving the DIP Loan be entered by no later  
 26 than January 15, 2020, see DIP Loan Agreement, p. 21, § 8.1(g), however, GLL agreed that that deadline was  
 extended to at least January 16, 2020 in light of the Court’s scheduling of the final hearing on the DIP Financing  
 Motion until then.

1 negotiations with GLL as a potential stalking horse bidder. In support of that potential sale  
 2 process and in order to comply with the Milestone Requirements, on January 6, 2020, the  
 3 Debtors filed their *Motion for Entry of Order (A) Approving Bid Procedures for Sale of Debtors'*  
 4 *Assets, (B) Approving Stalking Horse Bid Protections, (C) Scheduling Auction for, and Hearing*  
 5 *to Approve, Sale of Debtors' Assets, (D) Approving Form and Manner of Notices of Sale,*  
 6 *Auction and Sale Hearing, and (E) Approving Assumption and Assignment Procedures* [ECF No.  
 7 77]. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Debtors, with the assistance of their investment banker,  
 8 continued to market its assets for sale after the filing of these Chapter 11 Cases, which to date,  
 9 attracted two potentially interested parties that have signed non-disclosure agreements.

10       33. Final approval of the proposed DIP Financing Motion drew significant opposition  
 11 from both the Office of the United States Trustee and the Committee [ECF Nos. 91 and 97], and  
 12 the Court held an evidentiary hearing with respect to final approval of it on January 16, 2020.  
 13 After hearing evidence, including substantial cross-examination by the Committee of the  
 14 Debtors' CEO, Ryan Polk, the proposed DIP Lender made an offer of certain concessions from  
 15 the currently proposed terms of the DIP Financing, however, those were not accepted by the  
 16 Committee in full resolution of its objection, and thus the Court directed the Debtors to prepare  
 17 and file a written submission of those proposed concessions by 12:00 p.m. the following day,  
 18 which the Court would then review and rule on approval of the proposed financing.

19       34. By the Court-imposed deadline, however, the Debtors were unable to provide  
 20 such a list of financing concessions because the DIP Lender indicated that it no longer wanted to  
 21 fund the DIP Financing given, among other matters, the Committee's opposition to approval of it  
 22 at the final hearing and the demands asserted by the Committee to change the financing material  
 23 to the detriment of the DIP Lender, concerns that the collateral securing its DIP Financing was  
 24 insufficient to adequately secure the total amount of indebtedness, concerns that the Court would  
 25 not approve the proposed financing even as revised and without further adverse revisions to the  
 26 terms and conditions required by the DIP Lender. As a result, and in order to advise the Court  
 27 and all other parties in interest of the deteriorating situation, the Debtors filed a status report

1 [ECF No. 120], which advised that the DIP Lender was unwilling to proceed with the balance of  
 2 the DIP Loan on a final basis, and that the Debtor lacked any available funding in order to  
 3 proceed with its reorganization case. The Court thereafter entered an order setting a status  
 4 hearing on January 21, 2020 [ECF No. 121].

5       35. At the status hearing on January 21, 2020, the Debtors advised the Court that they  
 6 were unable to resolve issues with the Committee and the DIP Lender to secure additional  
 7 funding to continue operations, were unable to fund a payroll due immediately, and otherwise  
 8 lacked funds to continue operating as a debtor in possession under chapter 11, and as a result,  
 9 lacked an ability to reorganize. As a result, the Court invited parties to file a motion seeking  
 10 relief pursuant to section 1112 of the Bankruptcy Code, and discussed which relief might be  
 11 most appropriate, including the appointment of a chapter 11 trustee, appointment of an examiner,  
 12 conversion of the cases to chapter 7, or dismissal, was in the best interests of all creditors and  
 13 parties in interest.

14       36. Also as of January 21, 2020, the Debtors filed their completed bankruptcy  
 15 schedules and statement of financial affairs [ECF Nos. 126-137] to provide a full disclosure of its  
 16 assets and liabilities.

17       37. On January 22, 2020, the Court heard and orally approved the Debtors' retention  
 18 of its various professionals, including Debtors' general reorganization counsel, Larson Zirzow  
 19 Kaplan & Cottner and McDonald Hopkins, LLC; the Debtors' investment banker, Sutter  
 20 Securities, Inc.; and the Debtors' contract accountant, Signature Analytics. Also at this hearing,  
 21 the Debtors advised the Court that they would be filing this Motion seeking to convert their cases  
 22 to Chapter 7 that same day. In light of the impending conversion, the Debtors also advised the  
 23 Office of the United States Trustee that they would not be attending the continued initial debtor  
 24 interview (scheduled for January 22, 2020) or the first meeting of creditors pursuant to section  
 25 341 of the Bankruptcy Code (scheduled for January 23, 2020).

26       38. The Debtors file this Motion seeking to convert their cases to chapter 7 because  
 27 they lack sufficient funds to be able to support a reorganization under chapter 11, including even

1 a very expedited sale process, and do not otherwise generate sufficient cash from operations to  
 2 continue with that process. Additionally, the Debtors continue to accrue post-petition payables,  
 3 including obligations to employees and their own professionals, which they simply lack the  
 4 funds to pay.

### 5 III. LEGAL ARGUMENT

6 39. A debtor's voluntary request to convert a chapter 11 bankruptcy case to a  
 7 liquidation under chapter 7 is governed by section 1112(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, which  
 8 provides as follows:

9 (a) The debtor may convert a case under this chapter to a case  
 10 under chapter 7 of this title unless--

11 (1) the debtor is not a debtor in possession;

12 (2) the case originally was commenced as an  
 13 involuntary case under this chapter; or

14 (3) the case was converted to a case under this chapter  
 15 other than on the debtor's request.

16 11 U.S.C. § 1112(a) (emphasis added).

17 40. None of the three (3) statutory exceptions in section 1112(a)(1) through (3) of the  
 18 Bankruptcy Code apply in the case at hand, and thus the Debtors' request should be granted.  
 19 Further, there is no "extreme circumstances" exception to a debtor's ability to convert its case  
 20 voluntarily to chapter 7 pursuant to section 1112(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, and even to the  
 21 extent the Court determines that there is such an exception -- which determination would be  
 22 against the weight of authority -- there is no bad faith, improper purpose, or abuse of the  
 23 Bankruptcy Code present evident in the case at hand to deny the requested conversion to chapter  
 24 7. See In re Kimrow, Inc., 534 B.R. 219 (Bankr. M.D. Ga. 2015).

25 41. Good cause exists to approve the Debtors' voluntary request to convert their  
 26 Chapter 11 Cases to chapter 7 liquidations because the estates have been unable to obtain  
 27 sufficient financing necessary to remain in a chapter 11 reorganization and also do not otherwise

1 generate sufficient funds from operations to sustain such a process as well. Further, the Debtors  
2 are incurring continuing ongoing losses on a post-petition basis that they are unable to pay, and  
3 otherwise lack an ability to reorganize. Conversion of the cases to chapter 7 is in the best  
4 interests of the Debtors, their estates, and all creditors and parties in interest, and indeed given  
5 the situation, there is no other reasonable or practical solution that exists. For example, a chapter  
6 7 trustee may still seek authority to operate the Debtors' business pursuant to section 721 of the  
7 Bankruptcy Code, can determine independently, and without interference from a Committee,  
8 what is in the best interests of all creditors, and can pursue a recovery of potential assets,  
9 including potential Avoidance Actions, for the benefit of all creditors. Conversion is preferable  
10 to the appointment of a chapter 11 trustee or examiner, because the estates lack sufficient funds  
11 to support such appointments, and a dismissal of the bankruptcy cases is not preferable because  
12 the Debtors are clearly insolvent, and a dismissal would just leave all creditors in limbo and  
13 subject the Debtors to dismemberment from a wide variety of state and federal court lawsuits  
14 throughout the country, whereas a chapter 7 process could allow for an orderly liquidation in a  
15 unified bankruptcy proceeding and under the control of a neutral trustee, thereby avoiding the  
16 proverbial "race to the courthouse" contest among potentially competing creditors for what  
17 remains of the Debtors outside of bankruptcy if the cases were simply dismissed.

18       42. Additionally, although the Debtors assert that their cases should be converted to  
19 chapter 7 as a result of their voluntary request herein, and on the basis that none of the statutory  
20 limitations on such a request in section 1112(a)(1) through (3) of the Bankruptcy Code apply, to  
21 the extent the Court determines that a further analysis is needed, good and sufficient "cause" also  
22 exists to convert the case pursuant to section 1112(b)(4)(A) of the Bankruptcy Code for  
23 "substantial or continuing loss to or diminution of the estate and the absence of a reasonable  
24 likelihood of rehabilitation," to the extent a creditor or party in interest were to file such a motion  
25 for conversion or dismissal. Although such considerations are generally the focus of a motion  
26 brought by a creditor or party in interest pursuant to section 1112(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, not  
27 a voluntary motion to convert brought by a debtor pursuant to section 1112(a) such as the instant

1 Motion, such considerations, to the extent appropriately made in this context, also weigh in favor  
 2 of allowing the requested conversion to chapter 7. See In re Premier Golf Properties, LP, 564  
 3 B.R. 710, 723 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 2016); Rand v. Porsche Fin. Servs. (In re Rand), No. AZ-10-  
 4 1160-BaPaJu, 2010 WL 6259960, \*10 n.14 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. Dec. 7, 2010) (citing 7 Collier on  
 5 Bankruptcy ¶ 1112.04[7] (Alan N. Resnick & Henry J. Sommer, eds., 16th ed., 2010)).

6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7 WHEREFORE, the Debtors request that the Court convert their Chapter 11 Cases to  
 8 chapter 7. The Debtors also request such other and further relief as is just and proper.

9 DATED: January 22, 2020.

10 /s/ Matthew C. Zirzow  
 11 LARSON ZIRZOW KAPLAN & COTTNER  
 12 ZACHARIAH LARSON, ESQ.  
 13 Nevada Bar No. 7787  
 14 E-mail: zlarson@lzkclaw.com  
 15 MATTHEW C. ZIRZOW, ESQ.  
 16 Nevada Bar No. 7222  
 17 E-mail: mzirzow@lzkclaw.com  
 18 850 E. Bonneville Ave.  
 19 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 20 -and-  
 21 MCDONALD HOPKINS LLC  
 22 SCOTT N. OPINCAR (Ohio Bar# 0064027)  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
 23 E-mail: sopincar@mcdonaldhopkins.com  
 24 MICHAEL J. KACZKA (Ohio Bar# 0076548)  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
 25 E-mail: mkaczka@mcdonaldhopkins.com  
 26 600 Superior Avenue, East, Suite 2100  
 27 Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2653

22 Attorneys for Debtors

LARSON ZIRZOW KAPLAN & COTTNER  
 850 E. Bonneville Ave.  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
 Tel: (702) 382-1170 Fax: (702) 382-1169